

*File in  
Congressional  
Correspondence File*

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
CONCERNING HEARING ON HUMAN  
RIGHTS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY  
OCTOBER 27, 1977

*DIA's  
Office  
for  
Human  
Rights*

*General  
Policy*

## QUESTION ONE

On page five of Mr. Schneider's statement, it is indicated that an Inter-Agency Committee on Human Rights and Foreign Economic Assistance has been created. Is there a similar committee for security assistance? Would it be advisable to create one?

## ANSWER

At the present time there is no similar committee specifically designated for consideration of security assistance and human rights issues. However, there is an interagency forum for consideration of all aspects of arms transfer policy, including human rights concerns. Under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, this forum, the Arms Export Control Board, provides a focal point for discussion of security assistance matters. The Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs is a member of the Board. Members of her Bureau participate in all meetings of Arms Export Control Board working groups. Furthermore, other members of the Arms Export Control Board also participate in deliberations of the Interagency Committee on Human Rights. The Department is monitoring the degree to which current organizational arrangements insure full and adequate consideration of human rights issues.

*these  
Group  
and  
Foreign  
Assistance*

*Assisting*

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SPR~~

Change to  Release  Excise  Deny  Declassify

Exemptions b ( ) ( ) E.O. 13526 25x ( ) ( )

Declassify after \_\_\_\_\_

With concurrence of:

obtained not obt.

IPS by *✓* Date *1-3-78*

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
CONCERNING HEARING ON HUMAN  
RIGHTS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY  
OCTOBER 28, 1977

QUESTION THREE

The question of gauging progress in human rights and the appropriate response was highlighted by recent visits to Latin America by Secretary Todman. In all the countries he visited--Chile, Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay--his statements indicated considerable satisfaction at the progress being made in human rights. Frequently lacking from these statements--or at least the press coverage thereof--was sufficient attention to the remaining serious gaps in respect for human rights.

For example, on October 18 in Santo Domingo, Secretary Todman said the Department has been encouraged "by recent evidence that the trend away from democracy may be ending." He cited as an example the Government of Chile's "public commitment to a timetable." Would you elaborate on that commitment; my understanding is they have agreed to have elections well into the 1980's? Moreover, only a few months ago the Christian Democratic Party--the only political party which has not been banned--was also banned. Is it accurate to speak of progress in terms of democracy in Chile?

ANSWER

In responding to press conference questions concerning human rights problems and other developments in the countries to which you refer, Ambassador Todman has been motivated primarily by a desire to help improve the human rights situation in Latin America.

For one thing, Mr. Todman has tried to emphasize the readiness of our Government to recognize and ~~praise~~ whatever progress is made or promised, so as to encourage further progress. He has also tried to avoid the development of a sterile adversary relationship with other governments. In

that

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP~~

~~Change to~~

~~( ) Release ( ) Excise ( ) Deny ( ) Declassify~~

~~Exemptions b ( ) ( ) E.O. 13526 25x ( ) ( )~~

~~Declassify after~~

~~With concurrence of:~~

~~obtained~~ ~~not obt~~  
IPS by *W* Date *3-16*

-2-

addition, during his Southern Cone visit Mr. Todman was concerned with the high profile given him by the local press, which sometimes portrayed him as flying in to investigate, reward and punish. With all of these thoughts in mind, the Assistant Secretary emphasized positive development whenever there was any opportunity to do so. However, at no time did he allege that the human rights situation in the Southern Cone countries was satisfactory. And in his private conversations with the leaders of those countries he made a candid and vigorous presentation of our human rights concerns and objectives.

With regard to the above, it should also be kept in mind that newspapers tended to excerpt and highlight those portions of public statements which were most favorable from their viewpoint. [As one example, Mr. Todman made a point of visiting the Vicariate of Solidarity in Santiago, an organization well known for its courageous work on behalf of human rights. The publication of the Vicariate, Solidarity, devoted its entire front page to a photograph of Mr. Todman's visit, with the caption: "During his Visit Todman Praised the Work of the Vicariate".]

As regards your question on future elections in Chile, Mr. Todman recognized the "public commitment to a timetable" by President Pinochet. The latter's speech of July 9 seemed to represent a turning away from the totally anti-democratic principles of government which the military espoused after the 1973 coup. Ambassador Todman did not, in any way, imply that we approve either the particular proposal or its timetable. (specifically endorse)

Moreover, at the time of the speech, the Department emphasized its dissatisfaction with lengthy delay before changes would occur. It expressed the hope that a full and open democratic system would be established in keeping with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the traditional democratic spirit of the Chilean people.

With respect to the establishment of democratic political institutions in Chile, there has been no real progress to date. In March, 1977 the Chilean Government banned the

-3-

remaining political parties which had been put in "recess" since 1973. The Christian Democratic Party was not the only party banned at that time; several others, including the major National Party (conservative) were also banned then. The Department obviously regards the banning as a negative development and has expressed its concern to the Chilean Government. The Department continues to be disappointed with the lack of political freedom in Chile.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
CONCERNING HEARING ON HUMAN  
RIGHTS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY  
OCTOBER 27, 1977

QUESTION EIGHT

Regarding the response to question five of the prepared questions, the Department did not respond to the request for the determining factors in the situations in Uruguay, Argentina and Ethiopia which led to the reduction or termination of military credit sales for FY 1978. Could you tell us what were the determining factors?

ANSWER.

The Secretary's decision to reduce or eliminate Foreign Military Sales financing for Argentina and Uruguay in his Fiscal Year 1978 submission to the Congress resulted from the Administration's perception that the human rights practices of these governments had deteriorated to the point where such actions on the part of the United States were warranted. The human rights reports on these countries submitted to the Congress accompanying the Fiscal Year 1978 Security Assistance Congressional presentation give details of the conditions which led the Department to take this position.

As for Ethiopia, the Secretary's decision was based not only on deteriorating human rights conditions, but also on the unpredictable and precarious security situation prevailing in that country which contributes to the government's inability to provide the usual guarantees of fundamental human rights to its citizens. These conditions are also reported in the human rights report on Ethiopia submitted to Congress. There has been no change for the better in the meantime.

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP~~

Change to

Release  Excise  Deny  Declassify

Exemptions b ( ) ( ) ~~EQ 13526 25x ( ) ( )~~

Declassify after \_\_\_\_\_

With concurrence of:

obtained not obt.

IPS by 62 Date 11-3-16

*(Answer is  
not responsive  
to training  
will ask for a  
better answer.)*

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE  
 DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
 CONCERNING HEARING ON HUMAN  
 RIGHTS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY  
 OCTOBER 25, 1977

QUESTION TEN

The response to question five of the prepared questions indicates a systematic procedure for supervising the use of military equipment and military training. Have there been any examples where the host country has abused these programs?

What efforts are being made to monitor use of U.S. military equipment by the Government of Argentina?

ANSWER

The United States Embassy in Buenos Aires reports that officers of our Military Group in Argentina visit each Argentine armed forces installation where U.S. defense articles acquired through the Foreign Military Sales program are located on an average of three times per year. One principal purpose of these visits is to monitor the end-use of U.S. defense articles to ascertain whether the equipment is being used in accordance with the agreements under which it had been provided. The Embassy also reports that the Argentine armed forces are aware of the prohibitions on the use of defense articles acquired from the United States.

While no end-use monitoring system can absolutely assure that U.S.-origin defense articles are being used properly, the Embassy points out that the defense articles which Argentina has acquired from the United States Government in recent years are not, as far as can be ascertained, the types of items which would be suitable for civil law enforcement purposes.

Our Embassy and our Military Group will continue to be alert for evidence of misuse of U.S. military equipment, should they occur.

Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP  
 Change to

Release  Excise  Deny  Declassify

Exemptions   E.O. 13526 25x

Declassify after

With concurrence of:

IPS by  obtained not obt.

Date *11-16-16*

-2-

*Speaking more broadly,*

^ There have been instances where U.S.-origin military equipment has been used for purposes not in accordance with the bilateral agreements under which the equipment was provided. In such cases, our response has been in conformity with relevant legal requirements.

As for military training, the U.S. Government does not provide military training to any individuals who are members of a unit that has on-going civilian law enforcement functions or who might be assigned to such units within a reasonable period after the training. Recipient governments are aware of this policy, and we do not know of any abuses.

NAPT II

80D177

59-82-0096-1

HA Subject Files 1977

Box 1

PGOV - Congressional

(other Q+As attached but not copied)  
more final docs also in folder but not copied